

## 14.13 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

### 4.13.1 INTRODUCTION

Cumulative effects analysis broadens the scope of analysis to include effects beyond those solely attributable to the implementation of the alternatives. Cumulative effects are defined as the effects:

*on the environment which result from the incremental effect of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR Sec. 1508.7).*

The analysis in this section expands the geographic and temporal borders to include the effects on specific resources, ecosystems, and human communities that occur incrementally in conjunction with other actions, projects and trends. The purpose of cumulative effects analysis, as stated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) “is to ensure that federal decisions consider the full range of consequences” (CEQ, 1997:3).

The cumulative analysis begins with: 1) identifying past, present, and future actions and projects in association with the status of the resources, ecosystems, and human communities that may be affected, and 2) defining geographic borders and time frame of the analysis.

The status of affected resources is based upon the information provided in **Section 3** of this document, from specific resource studies that have been undertaken for the alternatives, and additional review and analysis. The geographic boundaries of the cumulative effects zone have been determined by the nature of the resources affected and the distance that effects may travel. For this analysis, the geographic boundaries of the cumulative effects zone are generally that of western Kenosha, the I-94 corridor, and surrounding area; although, analysis of Alternative C requires consideration of effects to the Keshena area.

The time frame of the cumulative effects analysis extends to 2025. Beyond 2025, information on growth patterns and future activities becomes more speculative and uncertainties increase, limiting the usefulness of such analysis. For some resources, information is unavailable to extend meaningful analysis even to 2025; however, attempts have been made to provide all relevant information.

As recommended by CEQ’s *Considering Cumulative Effects*, not all potential cumulative effects issues have been included in this EIS, only those that are considered to be relevant or consequential have been discussed in depth (CEQ, 1997:12).

### 4.13.2 LIST OF POTENTIALLY CUMULATIVE ACTIONS AND PROJECTS

Actions and projects that could contribute to cumulative impacts in the Kenosha area are described below.

#### ***TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS***

The projects described below would be constructed by 2017.

##### ***Interstate Route 94 (I-94)***

WisDOT plans to improve the I-94 ramps and frontage road intersections with 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. The current plan calls for a diamond interchange to be built and for the frontage roads to be located. This is proposed for construction in 2010.

##### ***52<sup>nd</sup> Street***

A traffic signal is planned at the intersection of 52<sup>nd</sup> Street and 95<sup>th</sup> Avenue by the City of Kenosha.

#### ***DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS***

The following projects are planned to be completed by 2007. **Figure 4.8-6** in **Section 4.8** shows the location of some of these projects.

1. *Kilbourn Woods* – This 240 acre subdivision has 98 lots proposed for single-family housing.
2. *Tyler's Ridge* – This 57 acre single-family subdivision has 155 proposed lots.
3. *Peterson Golden Meadows* – This single-family subdivision has 329 lots within 76.2 acres.
4. *Leona's Rolling Meadows* – This single-family subdivision has 192 lots in 113 acres.
5. *Lowes/Indian Trail Plaza* – This proposed commercial development consists of 236,000 square feet of proposed commercial space located on 30 acres.
6. *I 94/50 Retail Center* – This commercial development consists of 415,625 square feet of existing and proposed construction on 87.15 acres.
7. *New Village Preliminary Subdivision* – This single-family subdivision consists of 49 lots on 16.35 acres.
8. *BPOK Phase* – This industrial park expansion is proposed for 74.36 acres.

No significant potentially cumulative actions or projects are known in the Keshena area.

### **4.13.3 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED CASINO AND HOTEL**

#### ***WATER RESOURCES***

Due to the project features incorporated into the project, including the control of stormwater runoff and the discharge of wastewater to a publicly owned treatment facility, this alternative would not have significant cumulative effects on the water resources identified in **Section 3.3**, when it is combined with cumulative conditions in the project area. These water resources issues include surface water, drainage and flooding issues, surface water quality, stormwater runoff, wastewater and groundwater quality. The project would meet the water quality objectives of the WDNR and USEPA.

#### ***AIR QUALITY***

Operation of Alternative A during long-term conditions would result in the generation of VOC, CO and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The Menominee Nation has agreed in the IGA to enact air quality regulations or standards on the Federal trust land that are at least as stringent as air quality regulation or standards applicable to the County of Kenosha (**Appendix B**). Compliance with air quality standards would ensure that cumulative air quality impacts in the vicinity of the DGP would be less than significant. Future traffic air emissions would be decreased by recommended road improvements as indicated in the traffic discussion (**Section 4.8 and Section 5**). Therefore, this effect would be less than significant.

#### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

##### ***Wildlife and Habitats***

Disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity within the region as a consequence of improvements to Interstate 94 and continuing residential and commercial development in the Kenosha region up to the year 2025 would not have a significant adverse cumulative impact on wildlife and habitats. There is enough open space in the region to accommodate wildlife populations. The best habitat in the area is either in woodlots on farms or in the riparian floodplain forests of the major rivers and streams. Given the abundance of these habitats in the region, cumulative impacts of the proposed action, when considered within the context of other regional development projects, are negligible. No mitigation is required.

##### ***Federally Listed Species***

Disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity within the region as a consequence of improvements to Interstate 94 and continuing residential and commercial development in the Kenosha region up to the year 2025 could have an adverse cumulative impact on Federally listed species. However, there is abundant habitat and natural communities available in the region for use by Federally listed species, and cumulative development projects, when taken together with the Kenosha casino project, would not cause significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

***Migratory Birds***

Disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity within the region as a consequence of improvements to Interstate 94 and continuing residential and commercial development in the Kenosha region up to the year 2025 could have an adverse cumulative impact on migratory birds species. However, there is abundant habitat including waterways, farms, and natural communities available in the region for use by migrating birds, and that cumulative development projects, when taken together with the Kenosha casino project, would not cause significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

***Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.***

Incremental fill as a result of improvements to Interstate 94 and continuing residential and commercial development in the Kenosha region up to the year 2025 could have an adverse cumulative impact on wetlands and waters of the U.S. The proposed project, however, would not contribute to this impact. No mitigation is required.

***LAND RESOURCES******Agriculture***

The project site does not contain prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. Western portions of the property have been farmed recently by an adjacent landowner; however, the parcel is of marginal agricultural quality. Further, because the project site is currently developed with a dog race track and associated uses, undeveloped portions of the property are not available for agricultural purposes and the development of Alternative A would not result in the loss of available agricultural land. Therefore, the effects of Alternative A on agriculture would not contribute significantly to past, present or future effects of other projects on agriculture. No mitigation is required.

***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

Cultural resources inventoried in recent surveys may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. As these resources would be avoided by development, the SHPO has concurred that they would not be affected by the proposed undertaking. As no effects to cultural resources would result from the proposed alternative, no cumulative effects to cultural resources would occur as a result of the development of Alternative A.

***SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS***

Alternative A would introduce a new source of economic activity in the Kenosha area. The creation of jobs and increased sales tax revenue that would result from the project are considered to be beneficial effects. Potential increased social costs associated with gambling (including lost productivity, increased theft, criminal prosecution and incarceration, therapy and social welfare)

may occur, however, these effects would be mitigated by the measures specified in **Section 5.0**. No significant cumulative socioeconomic effects would occur.

## **RESOURCE USE**

### **Transportation**

The future (2017) conditions include background, site plus background, and total traffic numbers anticipated for the year 2017. “Background” consists of the “no-build” traffic volumes, which are projections provided by WisDOT considering the existing transportation system and the proposed improvements. The “background plus project” is the project traffic volumes for Alternative A added to the background traffic volumes. “Total traffic” is the addition of traffic volumes generated by other proposed and approved projects to Alternative A project traffic volumes and then added to the background traffic volumes.

#### *Peak Hour Intersection Effects*

Peak hour intersection volumes for 2017 were calculated for the background, background plus project and total traffic condition. **Figure 4.13-1** shows the 2017 background traffic volumes. As shown in **Table 4.13-1**, the following study intersections have an unacceptable LOS without mitigation measures even if Alternative A is not implemented:

- 52nd Street/88th Avenue (EBTR and SBA in PM)
- 52nd Street/104th Avenue (SBA in AM)
- 52nd Street/120th Avenue (NBL in AM; NBL in PM)

**Figure 4.13-2** shows the 2017 Background Plus Project traffic volumes. With the Background Plus Project traffic added to the study intersections, as shown in **Table 4.13-2**, the following intersections have an unacceptable LOS without mitigation measures:

- 52nd Street/88th Avenue (EBTR, WBTR, SBA and overall in AM; EBL, EBTR, WBTR, SBA and overall in PM)
- 52nd Street/104th Avenue (NBA and SBA in AM; NBA and SBA in PM)
- 52nd Street/120th Avenue (NBL and SBL in AM; NBL and SBL in PM)
- 52nd Street/NB I-94 Ramp (NBLT in AM; NBLT in PM)
- 60th Street/104th Avenue (WBA, NBTR, and overall in PM)

**TABLE 4.13-1**  
2017 BACKGROUND LEVEL OF SERVICE - KENOSHA PROJECT SITE

Intersection	Background			
	AM		PM	
	With Improvements	Without Improvements	With Improvements	Without Improvements
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/88 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – B	EBL – C	EBL – B	EBL – B
	EBTR – C	EBTR – D	EBTR – C	EBTR – F
	WBL – B	WBL – B	WBL – C	WBL – B
	WBTR – C	WBTR – D	WBTR – C	WBTR – C
	NBA – C	NBA – C	NBA – D	NBA – C
	SBLT – C	---	SBLT – D	---
	SBR – B	---	SBR – A	---
	---	SBA – D	---	SBA – E
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – C	---	EBL – C	---
	EBT – C	---	EBT – D	---
	EBR – C	---	EBR – C	---
	WBL – C	---	WBL – C	---
	WBTR – C	---	WBTR – C	---
	---	NBA – D	---	NBA – C
	NBL – C	---	NBL – C	---
	NBLT – C	---	NBLT – C	---
	NBR – C	---	NBR – B	---
	SBL – D	---	SBL – D	---
	SBTR – D	---	SBTR – D	---
	---	SBA – E	---	SBA – D
	<b>Overall – C</b>		<b>Overall – C</b>	
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Greyhound Access	EBT – B	---	EBT – C	---
	---	EBTR – B	---	EBTR – C
	---	EBR – A	---	EBR – A
	WBL – A	WBL – A	WBL – A	WBL – A
	WBT – A	WBT – A	WBT – A	WBT – A
	NBL – C	NBL – C	NBL – D	NBL – D
	NBR – B	NBR – B	NBR – B	NBR – B
	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	NBL – E	NBL – E	NBL – F	NBL – F
	SBL – D	SBL – D	SBL – D	SBL – D
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/NB I-94 Ramp	NBLT – C	NBLT – C	NBLT – C	NBLT – C
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/SB I-94Ramp	EBT – D	EBT – D	EBT – D	EBT – D
	EBR – D	EBR – D	EBR – D	EBR – D
	WBL – B	WBL – B	WBL – B	WBL – B
	WBT – B	WBT – B	WBT – B	WBT – B
	SBL – C	SBL – C	SBL – C	SBL – C
	SBLTR – C	SBLTR – C	SBLTR – C	SBLTR – C
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Western Frontage Rd.	WBLR – A	WBLR – A	WBLR – A	WBLR – A
	NBTR – A	NBTR – A	NBTR – A	NBTR – A
	SBLT – A	SBLT – A	SBLT – A	SBLT – A
	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>
60 <sup>th</sup> Street/104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – B	---	EBL – B	---
	---	EBLT – B	---	EBLT – C
	EBTR – C	---	EBTR – C	---
	---	EBR – A	---	EBR – A
	WBL – B	---	WBL – B	---
	WBTR – C	---	WBTR – C	---
	---	WBA – B	---	WBA – C

Intersection	Background			
	AM		PM	
	With Improvements	Without Improvements	With Improvements	Without Improvements
	NBL – B	NBL – A	NBL – B	NBL – B
	NBTR – C	NBTR – B	NBTR – C	NBTR – C
	SBL – B	---	SBL – B	---
	---	SBLT – B	---	SBLT – B
	---	SBR – A	---	SBR – A
	SBTR – C	---	SBTR – C	---
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>
60 <sup>th</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Street	EBA – A	EBA – A	EBA – B	EBA – B
	WBA – A	WBA – A	WBA – B	WBA – B
	NBA – A	NBA – A	NBA – B	NBA – B
	SBA – A	SBA – A	SBA – B	SBA – B
	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>
104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue/Southern Access	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

NOTE: Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.  
 EBL – eastbound left lane;  
 EBTR – eastbound through/right lane;  
 EBT – eastbound through lane;  
 EBR – eastbound right lane;  
 EBA – eastbound approach lane;  
 WBL – westbound left lane;  
 WBA – westbound approach lane;  
 WBT – westbound through lane;  
 WBTR – westbound through/right lane;  
 SBLT – southbound left/through lane;  
 SBR – southbound right lane;  
 SBA – southbound approach lane;  
 SBL – southbound left lane;  
 SBTR – southbound through/right lane;  
 SBLR – southbound left turn/right turn combination lane;  
 NBL – northbound left lane;  
 NBR – northbound right lane;  
 NBTR – northbound through/right lane;  
 NBA – northbound approach lane;  
 NBLT – northbound left turn/right turn combination lane.

SOURCE: Land Strategies, 2005; AES, 2005

**TABLE 4.13-2**  
**2017 BACKGROUND PLUS PROJECT LEVEL OF SERVICE - KENOSHA PROJECT SITE**

Intersection	Background Plus Project			
	AM		PM	
	With Improvements	Without Improvements	With Improvements	Without Improvements
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/88 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – C	EBL – C	EBL – D	EBL – F
	EBT – C	---	EBT – D	---
	EBR – C	---	EBR – C	---
	---	EBTR – F	---	EBTR – F
	WBL – B	WBL – B	WBL – C	WBL – B
	WBT – C	---	WBT – D	---
	WBR – B	---	WBR – B	---
	---	WBTR – F	---	WBTR – F
	---	NBA – C	---	NBA – D
	NBL – C	---	NBL – C	---
	NBTR – C	---	NBTR – C	---
	---	SBA – F	---	SBA – F
	SBL – B	---	SBL – C	---
	SBTR – C	---	SBTR – C	---
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – F</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – F</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – D	---	EBL – D	---
	EBT – D	---	EBT – D	---
	EBR – A	---	EBR – A	---
	WBL – D	---	WBL – D	---
	WBT – C	---	WBT – C	---
	WBR – B	---	WBR – B	---
	---	NBA – F	---	NBA – F
	NBL – C	---	NBL – D	---
	NBLT – C	---	NBLT – D	---
	---	SBA – F	---	SBA – F
	SBL – D	---	SBL – D	---
	SBTR – D	---	SBTR – D	---
	<b>Overall – C</b>		<b>Overall – D</b>	
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Greyhound Access	EBT – B	---	EBT – D	---
	---	EBTR – B	---	EBTR – D
	---	EBR – C	---	EBR – C
	WBL – D	WBL – B	WBL – D	WBL – D
	WBT – A	WBT – A	WBT – A	WBT – D
	NBL – D	NBL – D	NBL – D	NBL – B
	NBR – B	NBR – B	NBR – A	NBR – B
	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	NBL – F	NBL – F	NBL – F	NBL – F
	SBL – F	SBL – F	SBL – F	SBL – F
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/NB I-94 Ramp	NBLT – E	NBLT – E	NBLT – F	NBLT – F
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/SB I-94Ramp	EBT – D	EBT – D	EBT – D	EBT – D
	EBR – D	EBR – D	EBR – D	EBR – D
	WBL – C	WBL – C	WBL – C	WBL – C
	WBT – B	WBT – B	WBT – B	WBT – B
	SBL – C	SBL – C	SBL – C	SBL – C
	SBLTR – C	SBLTR – C	SBLTR – C	SBLTR – C
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Western Frontage Rd.	WBLR – A	WBLR – A	WBLR – A	WBLR – A
	NBTR – A	NBTR – A	NBTR – A	NBTR – A
	SBLT – A	SBLT – A	SBLT – A	SBLT – A
	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>



Intersection	Background Plus Project			
	AM		PM	
	With Improvements	Without Improvements	With Improvements	Without Improvements
60 <sup>th</sup> Street/104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – B	---	EBL – B	---
	---	EBLT – B	---	EBLT – D
	EBTR – C	---	EBTR – C	---
	---	EBR – A	---	EBR – B
	---	WBA – D	---	WBA – <b>F</b>
	WBL – B	---	WBL – C	---
	WBT – C	---	WNT – C	---
	WBR – C	---	WBR – C	---
	NBL – B	NBL – B	NBL – B	NBL – B
	NBTR – C	NBTR – C	NBTR – C	NBTR – <b>F</b>
	SBL – B	---	SBL – C	---
	---	SBLT – B	---	SBLT – D
	---	SBR – A	---	SBR – B
	SBTR – C	---	SBTR – C	---
60 <sup>th</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Street	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – F</b>
	EBA – A	EBA – A	EBA – B	EBA – B
	WBA – A	WBA – A	WBA – B	WBA – B
	NBA – A	NBA – A	NBA – B	NBA – B
	SBA – A	SBA – A	SBA – B	SBA – B
104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue/Southern Access	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>
	EBL – C		EBL – C	
	NBL – B		NBL – B	
	NBT – B	N/A	NBT – C	N/A
	SBT – C		SBT – C	
	SBR – A		SBR – A	
	<b>Overall – B</b>		<b>Overall – C</b>	

NOTE: Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.

EBL – eastbound left lane;  
 EBTR – eastbound through/right lane;  
 EBT – eastbound through lane;  
 EBR – eastbound right lane;  
 EBA – eastbound approach lane;  
 WBL – westbound left lane;  
 WBA – westbound approach lane;  
 WBT – westbound through lane;  
 WBTR – westbound through/right lane;  
 SBLT – southbound left/through lane;  
 SBR – southbound right lane;  
 SBA – southbound approach lane;  
 SBL – southbound left lane;  
 SBTR – southbound through/right lane;  
 SBLR – southbound left turn/right turn combination lane;  
 NBL – northbound left lane;  
 NBR – northbound right lane;  
 NBTR – northbound through/right lane;  
 NBA – northbound approach lane;  
 NBLT – northbound left turn/right turn combination lane.

SOURCE: Land Strategies, Inc., 2005; AES, 2005

Figure 4.13-1 2017 Background traffic volumes.

Figure 4.13-2 2017 Background Plus Project Traffic

**Figure 4.13-3** shows the 2017 Total Traffic volumes. With the total traffic added to the study intersections, as shown in **Table 4.13-3**, the following intersections have an unacceptable LOS without mitigation measures:

- 52nd Street/88th Avenue (EBTR, WBTR, SBA and overall in AM; EBL, EBTR, WBTR, SBA and overall in PM)
- 52nd Street/104th Avenue (NBA and SBA in AM; NBA and SBA in PM)
- 52nd Street/120th Avenue (NBL and SBL in AM; NBL and SBL in PM)
- 52nd Street/NB I-94 Ramp (NBLT in AM; NBLT in PM)
- 60th Street/104th Avenue (WBA in AM; EBLT, WBA, NBTR, and overall in PM)

Mitigation for cumulative traffic impacts is specified in **Section 5.0**.

**TABLE 4.13-3**  
2017 TOTAL TRAFFIC LEVEL OF SERVICE - KENOSHA PROJECT SITE

Intersection	Total Traffic			
	AM		PM	
	With Improvements	Without Improvements	With Improvements	Without Improvements
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/88 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – C	EBL – C	EBL – D	EBL – F
	EBT – C	---	EBT – D	---
	EBR – C	---	EBR – B	---
	---	EBTR – F	---	EBTR – F
	WBL – B	WBL – B	WBL – C	WBL – B
	WBT – C	---	WBT – D	---
	WBR – B	---	WBR – B	---
	---	WBTR – F	---	WBTR – F
	---	NBA – C	---	NBA – D
	NBL – C	---	NBL – C	---
	NBTR – C	---	NBTR – D	---
	---	SBA – F	---	SBA – F
	SBL – B	---	SBL – C	---
	SBTR – C	---	SBTR – D	---
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – F</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – F</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	EBL – D	---	EBL – C	---
	EBT – D	---	EBT – D	---
	EBR – C	---	EBR – A	---
	WBL – D	---	WBL – D	---
	WBT – C	---	WBT – D	---
	WBR – B	---	WBR – C	---
	---	NBA – F	---	NBA – F
	NBL – D	---	NBL – D	---
	NBLT – D	---	NBLT – D	---
	NBR – D	---	NBR – D	---
	---	SBA – F	---	SBA – F
	SBL – D	---	SBL – D	---
	SBTR – D	---	SBTR – D	---
	<b>Overall – C</b>		<b>Overall – D</b>	
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Greyhound Access	EBT – C	---	EBT – D	---
	---	EBTR – C	---	EBTR – D
	---	EBR – A	---	EBR – D

Intersection	Total Traffic			
	AM		PM	
	With Improvements	Without Improvements	With Improvements	Without Improvements
	WBL – D	WBL – D	WBL – C	WBL – D
	WBT – A	WBT – A	WBT – A	WBT – A
	NBL – C	NBL – D	NBL – D	NBL – D
	NBR – B	NBR – B	NBR – B	NBR – B
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	NBL – <b>F</b>	NBL – <b>F</b>	NBL – <b>F</b>	NBL – <b>F</b>
	SBL – <b>F</b>	SBL – <b>F</b>	SBL – <b>F</b>	SBL – <b>F</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/NB I-94 Ramp	NBLT – <b>E</b>	NBLT – <b>E</b>	NBLT – <b>F</b>	NBLT – <b>F</b>
	EBT – D	EBT – D	EBT – D	EBT – D
	EBR – D	EBR – D	EBR – D	EBR – D
	WBL – D	WBL – D	WBL – C	WBL – C
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/SB I-94Ramp	WBT – B	WBT – B	WBT – B	WBT – B
	SBL – D	SBL – D	SBL – D	SBL – D
	SBLTR – D	SBLTR – D	SBLTR – D	SBLTR – D
	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>	<b>Overall – D</b>
52 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Western Frontage Rd.	WBLR – A	WBLR – A	WBLR – A	WBLR – A
	NBTR – A	NBTR – A	NBTR – A	NBTR – A
	SBLT – A	SBLT – A	SBLT – A	SBLT – A
	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>	<b>Overall – A</b>
	EBL – B	---	EBL – B	---
	EBTR – C	---	EBTR – D	---
	---	EBLT – C	---	EBLT – <b>F</b>
	---	EBR – A	---	EBR – B
	---	WBA – <b>F</b>	---	WBA – <b>F</b>
	WBL – B	---	WBL – D	---
	WBT – C	---	WBT – C	---
60 <sup>th</sup> Street/104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	WBR – C	---	WBR – C	---
	NBL – B	NBL – B	NBL – B	NBL – B
	NBTR – C	NBTR – C	NBTR – D	NBTR – <b>E</b>
	SBL – B	---	SBL – C	---
	SBTR – C	---	SBTR – C	---
	---	SBLT – C	---	SBLT – D
	---	SBR – B	---	SBR – B
	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – E</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – F</b>
	EBA – B	EBA – B	EBA – C	EBA – C
60 <sup>th</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Street	WBA – B	WBA – B	WBA – C	WBA – C
	NBA – B	NBA – B	NBA – C	NBA – C
	SBA – A	SBA – A	SBA – B	SBA – B
	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – B</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>	<b>Overall – C</b>
	EBL – C	N/A	EBL – C	N/A
	NBL – B		NBL – B	
104 <sup>th</sup> Avenue/Southern Access	NBT – B		NBT – C	
	SBT – C		SBT – C	
	SBR – A		SBR – A	
	<b>Overall – C</b>		<b>Overall – C</b>	

NOTES: Bold text denotes unacceptable LOS.  
 EBL – eastbound left lane;  
 EBTR – eastbound through/right lane;  
 EBT – eastbound through lane;  
 EBR – eastbound right lane;  
 EBA – eastbound approach lane;

WBL – westbound left lane;  
WBA – westbound approach lane;  
WBT – westbound through lane;  
WBTR – westbound through/right lane;  
SBLT – southbound left/through lane;  
SBR – southbound right lane;  
SBA – southbound approach lane;  
SBL – southbound left lane;  
SBTR – southbound through/right lane;  
SBLR – southbound left turn/right turn combination lane;  
NBL – northbound left lane;  
NBR – northbound right lane;  
NBTR – northbound through/right lane;  
NBA – northbound approach lane;  
NBLT – northbound left turn/right turn combination lane.

SOURCE: Land Strategies, Inc., 2005; AES, 2005

---

Figure 4.13-3 2017 Total Traffic

### ***PUBLIC SERVICES***

The City of Kenosha regulates land uses in the project vicinity through zoning. Allowable land uses are specified in the Kenosha Corridor Land Use Plan. The City has discretionary authority regarding any potential changes to allowable land uses in the project vicinity. The demand for public services is generally driven by land uses. Cumulative effects to public services would be less than significant because development within the project area would be accommodated by existing and planned public services, consistent with City zoning. Specific public services are discussed below.

#### ***Water Supply***

Water demands for Wisconsin and Kenosha have been projected through the year 2025. Between 2005 and 2025 water demands in Wisconsin are expected to increase from 653 million gallons per day (MGD) to 704.2 MGD or approximately 8%. For Kenosha County water use is projected to increase from 16.84 MGD in 2005 to 18.5 MGD or an increase of approximately 9% (Southern Illinois University, 2004). Lake Michigan is the water source that would meet this demand at least through 2025. The Kenosha Water Utility (KWU) has a water treatment capacity of 41.7 MGD. The City plans to upgrade and expand existing water service as discussed in **Section 4.9**.

The KWU would supply water for Alternative A. Through the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Tribe (Appendix B), the City of Kenosha has agreed to provide water services to the proposed project and the Tribe has agreed to pay the usual fees for water service and improvement costs necessary to service the proposed project (Section 1A, 1J). As mentioned in Section 4.9 the peak water demand for Alternative A is 991,481 gallons per day (gpd) which is based on facilities being used at full capacity. The Tribe would pay all costs to provide water service to the property and the continuing costs to supply water to the casino, hotel, and associated facilities. Upgrades to the KWU water system are already planned to accommodate growth on the west side of the City. These upgrades would serve both the DGP and other planned development projects listed previously. Since these infrastructure upgrades would be implemented concurrently with planned growth, no significant cumulative impacts to the water system would occur.

#### ***Wastewater Service***

The City of Kenosha would provide wastewater service under Alternative A. As with water, the City of Kenosha has agreed to provide wastewater services to the proposed project and the Tribe has agreed to pay the usual fees for wastewater service and improvement costs necessary to service the proposed project (Section 1A, 1J).

After Phase II is completed, Alternative A would have an estimated average flow of 452,481 gpd. The existing city wastewater plant would treat wastewater from the property. The total amount of



wastewater the City wastewater plant would treat would be approximately 18.5 MGD. The City currently has capacity at its wastewater plant for Alternative A and planned growth. Improvements to the wastewater system are planned and would be implemented concurrently with planned growth on the west side of the City. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts to the wastewater system.

### ***Solid Waste***

The State of Wisconsin's municipal solid waste generation is projected to increase from 4,626,880 tons per year in 2005 to 4,867,640 in 2010, resulting in a total expected increase of 240,760 tons (Franklin Associates, Ltd, 2002). Alternative A would generate 15.64 tons per day, or 5,709 tons per year. This constitutes approximately 0.1% of the total waste generation in the State. This amount, when added to new waste generation from other sources in the State, is not cumulatively significant because it is within the planned capacity of solid waste disposal facilities in the area.

### ***Other Public Services***

As discussed in **Section 4.9**, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical services would be provided to the project site. Tribal security staff and the Kenosha Police Department would provide law enforcement. The Kenosha Fire Department would provide fire protection services. The Kenosha Police and Fire Department employ strategic planning to prepare for future demands. Estimates for funding, equipment, and staff are based on population and calls for service, among a variety of other factors. The Tribe would coordinate with service providers to ensure adequate utility services are available. No significant cumulative effects to public services have been identified.

## ***OTHER VALUES***

### ***Noise***

As stated previously, the Tribe has adopted the Kenosha noise ordinance in the IGA (**Appendix B**). Compliance with the adopted noise ordinance would ensure that cumulative noise impacts in the vicinity of the DGP would be less than significant. Future traffic noise would be decreased by recommended road improvements as indicated in the traffic discussion (**Section 4.8 and Section 5**).

### ***Hazardous Materials***

The casino would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been specified to minimize the potential for incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.

### ***Visual Resources***

Cumulative effects on visual resources would come from development around the existing DGP clubhouse in phases I and II combined with the other proposed developments listed previously. Development under this alternative contributes to the existing and cumulative trend of urbanization in western Kenosha. Since this trend is part of planned growth consistent with City zoning and design (aesthetic) standards, it would not constitute a significant cumulative impact.

## **4.13.2 ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

### ***LAND RESOURCES***

No significant changes to the existing landforms would result as no additional construction or expansion of the facility would be proposed. Accordingly, no cumulative effects would occur.

### ***WATER RESOURCES***

Alternative B would not have significant effects on water quality or drainage when combined with cumulative conditions in the project area. The treated wastewater and storm water runoff would meet the water quality objectives of the WDNR and the EPA. Stormwater volumes would be appropriately accommodated by infrastructure upgrades.

### ***AIR QUALITY***

The Tribe would promulgate air quality standards that are no less stringent than Kenosha air quality standards. Compliance with the Tribal air quality standards would ensure that cumulative air quality impacts in the vicinity of the DGP would be less than significant. Future traffic air emissions would be decreased by recommended road improvements as indicated in the traffic discussion (**Section 4.8 and Section 5**). Under this alternative, emissions would be similar to those originally planned when the DGP was built.

### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

As no additional construction or expansion would take place under this alternative, no direct or cumulative impacts to Federally listed species, migratory birds or jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.” would occur. Disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity within the region as a consequence of improvements to Interstate 94 and continuing residential and commercial development in the Kenosha region up to the year 2025 could have an adverse cumulative impact on wildlife and habitats. Alternative B would not involve direct effects or indirect effects to any Federally listed species. Therefore, Alternative B would not contribute to cumulative effects to Federally listed species. Alternative B would not result in direct or indirect effects to nesting migratory birds. However, increases in human activity and disturbance to habitats within the proposed project area could incrementally contribute to present and future effects. Given the existing degraded condition of habitats adjacent to the subject parcel and the level of human

activity currently existing within the project vicinity, Alternative B would not contribute to significant cumulative effects to nesting migratory birds. Alternative B would not directly affect “waters of the U.S.” Adverse indirect effects to “waters of the U.S.” would be avoided by the implementation of project features designed to control stormwater runoff. Therefore, Alternative B would not contribute to significant cumulative effects to “waters of the U.S.”.

#### ***SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS***

Alternative B would cause increased economic activity in Kenosha. The creation of jobs and increased sales tax revenue that would result from the project would be beneficial effects. Public services that could potentially be affected include law enforcement and transportation. Potential effects to these services would be offset from the Tribe’s financial reimbursement for the service. Effects to schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minor. No significant cumulative socioeconomic effects would occur.

#### ***RESOURCE USE***

##### ***Transportation***

The project traffic impacts in the Future (2017) Condition under this alternative would be similar to what was originally envisioned when the DGP was built. Alternative B would be constructed in the existing first and third floor of the existing Clubhouse, an area totaling 93,680 square feet. No additional floor space would be added, and the traffic generated by Alternative B would be accommodated by the planned infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.

#### ***PUBLIC SERVICES***

The City of Kenosha governs land use in the project vicinity. Allowable land uses are specified in the Kenosha Corridor Land Use Plan. The City has discretionary authority regarding any potential changes to land uses in the project vicinity. Cumulative effects to public services would be less than significant because development of the project area would be accommodated by existing and planned public services. Because Alternative B is similar to the existing DGP in terms of public services needs, there would be no cumulative effects for Alternative B.

#### ***OTHER VALUES***

##### ***Noise***

The Tribe would adopt the Kenosha noise ordinance. Compliance with the adopted noise ordinance would ensure that cumulative noise impacts in the vicinity of the DGP would be less than significant.

***Hazardous Materials***

This alternative would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been defined to decrease hazards from any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.

***Visual Resources***

There would be no cumulative visual impacts associated with Alternative B because exterior changes to the DGP clubhouse and facilities would be negligible.

**4.13.3 ALTERNATIVE C – KESHENA SITE ALTERNATIVE*****WATER RESOURCES***

Alternative C would not have significant cumulative effects on water quality when it is considered with other projects in the area. Wastewater would continue to be treated by the Menomonee Tribal Utility District. Wastewater and storm water runoff would continue to meet the water quality objectives of WDNR and the USEPA. No other significant development is projected near the Keshena site, and therefore no significant water resources impacts would occur.

***AIR QUALITY***

The Tribe would promulgate air quality standards that are no less stringent than Menominee County standards. As the project area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants, continued compliance with the air quality standards would ensure that cumulative air quality impacts in the vicinity would be less than significant.

***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Proposed construction would consist of modifications or replacement of existing structures within previously developed areas. This precludes direct impacts to sensitive wildlife and habitats. Therefore, Alternative C would not result in significant cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats. Alternative C would not involve direct effects or indirect effects to any Federally listed species. Therefore, Alternative C would not result in significant cumulative effects to Federally listed species. Given the existing degraded condition of habitats adjacent to the proposed development areas and the level of human activity currently existing within the project vicinity, Alternative C would not result in significant cumulative effects to nesting migratory birds. Alternative C would not affect any “waters of the U.S.”. Therefore, Alternative C would not result in significant cumulative effects to “waters of the U.S.”.

***SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS***

Alternative C would increase economic activity in Keshena. The creation of jobs and increased sales tax revenue that would result from the project would be beneficial. Public services that

could potentially be affected include law enforcement and transportation. Potential effects to these services would be offset by the Tribe providing the service or financial reimbursement for the service. Effects to schools, libraries, and parks would be minor. No significant cumulative socioeconomic effects would occur.

#### ***RESOURCE USE***

##### ***Transportation***

The additional trips generated by this alternative would be relatively small and this alternative is located in a remote area with little traffic. The distribution of trips would occur on the same roadways identified under the existing setting for the Keshena site described in **Section 3.8-2**. The trips generated by this alternative would be added to the local roadway network. Due to the rural nature of the site, the large excess capacity of existing roadways and the lack of other planned development in the area, cumulative traffic impacts would be less than significant.

##### ***PUBLIC SERVICES***

The Tribe governs land use in the project vicinity. Allowable land uses are specified in tribal ordinances and resolutions of the tribal council. The tribal council has discretionary authority regarding any potential changes to land uses in the project vicinity. No significant cumulative effects to public services would occur because development of the project area would be accommodated by existing and planned public services, and because no other significant development in the area is contemplated.

#### ***OTHER VALUES***

##### ***Noise***

The Keshena site is located on trust land and no off-site sensitive receptors are located in the vicinity. There are no other noise-generating projects that are planned in the area. Therefore, the cumulative increase of noise levels in the area would not constitute a significant impact.

##### ***Hazardous Materials***

This alternative would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been defined to decrease the potential for any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.

##### ***Visual Resources***

The visual impact of this alternative is confined to expansion of the tribe's existing casino facility. No other significant development is anticipated in the project vicinity, and therefore no cumulative visual impacts would occur.

#### **4.13.4 ALTERNATIVE D – HOTEL-CONFERENCE CENTER AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

##### ***WATER RESOURCES***

Cumulative effects to water resources under Alternative D would be the same as those discussed under Alternative A.

##### ***AIR QUALITY***

The Tribe would promulgate air quality standards that are no less stringent than Kenosha standards. Compliance with the air quality standards would ensure that cumulative air quality impacts in the vicinity of the DGP would be less than significant. Future traffic air emissions would be decreased by recommended road improvements as indicated in the traffic discussion (Section 4.8 and Section 5).

##### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Cumulative effects to biological resources under Alternative D would not be significant. For more detailed information please see the discussion under Alternative A.

##### ***SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS***

Alternative D would introduce increased economic activity in Kenosha. The creation of jobs and increased sales tax revenue that would result from the project are considered to be beneficial effects. Potential effects to these services would be offset from the Tribe's financial reimbursement for the service. Effects to schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minor. No significant cumulative socioeconomic effects would occur.

##### ***RESOURCE USE***

###### ***Transportation***

Alternative D would contribute to cumulative impacts to utility services, solid waste, fire and police. However, the Tribe, through agreement with the City, would address its proportionate contribution to these impacts.

###### ***PUBLIC SERVICES***

Cumulative impacts from Alternative D would be less than significant. For more detailed information please see the discussion under Alternative A.

***OTHER VALUES***

***Noise***

The Tribe would adopt the Kenosha noise ordinance. Compliance with the adopted noise ordinance would ensure that cumulative noise impacts in the vicinity of the DGP would be less than significant.

***Hazardous Materials***

This alternative would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been defined to decrease potential hazards from any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.

***Visual Resources***

Development under this alternative contributes to the existing and cumulative trend of urbanization in western Kenosha. Since this trend is part of planned growth consistent with City zoning and design (aesthetic) standards, it would not constitute a significant cumulative impact.

**4.13.5 ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION**

Use and development under Alternative E would continue according to existing conditions and under the authority of local jurisdictions. Therefore, the No Action alternative would not result in adverse cumulative effects.